

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 29 2006****PATENT**  
Atty. Dkt. No. LCNT/121494  
Serial No. 09/811,911  
Page 5 of 8**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application of which claims 1-11 are rejected and claims 12-23 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicant hereby cancels withdrawn claims 12-23. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims 12-23 in one or more continuation and/or divisional applications.

The drawings are objected to by the Examiner as informal. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, the Office Action stating that those claims are drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether

477498-1

**PATENT**

Atty. Dkt. No. LCNT/121494

Serial No. 09/811,911

Page 6 of 8

a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewriting to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

**Objection to the Drawing**

The drawings are objected to by the Examiner as informal. Formal drawings will be supplied when the application is allowed.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner asserts that Applicant's limitation of periodically synchronizing databases is unclear because it is not clear what the synchronizing step entails. Although Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as filed, was sufficiently clear with respect to the step of synchronizing in that the step of synchronizing clearly states that at least one database of a first computing device is synchronized with at least one corresponding database of a second computing device, the Examiner's objection with respect to this limitation is moot in view of Applicant's amendments to claim 1.

The Examiner further asserts that claim 1 is not sufficiently precise due to the combining of two different statutory classes of invention in a single claim. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the body of the claim discusses the specifics of an apparatus and a method. Although Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, both as originally filed and as amended herein, is clearly directed toward one statutory class, namely, a method, since Applicant has herein amended claim 1 to remove the limitation asserted by the Examiner to be directed toward an apparatus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection is moot.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 and are allowable. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

## PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. LCNT/121494

Serial No. 09/811,911

Page 7 of 8

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 101**

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, the Office Action stating that those claims are drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the body of claim 1 discusses the specifics of a system and a method, asserting that claim 1 includes two statutory classes of invention as set forth under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Although Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, both as originally filed and as amended herein, is clearly directed toward one statutory class, namely, a method, since Applicant has herein amended claim 1 to remove the limitation asserted by the Examiner to be directed toward a system, namely, Applicant's limitation of "each of said first and second computing devices cooperating to track expenditures associated with at least one budgetary item," Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection is moot.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 and are allowable. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. LCNT/121494  
Serial No. 09/811,911  
Page 8 of 8

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Eamon Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 29 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/29/06

EJ Wall

Eamon J. Wall  
Registration No. 39,414  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Facsimile: 732-530-9808